

BETTI NUMBERS AND SHIFTS IN MINIMAL GRADED FREE RESOLUTIONS

TIM RÖMER

ABSTRACT. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring and $R = S/I$ where $I \subset S$ is a graded ideal. The Multiplicity Conjecture of Herzog, Huneke, and Srinivasan states that the multiplicity of R is bounded above by a function of the maximal shifts in the minimal graded free resolution of R over S as well as bounded below by a function of the minimal shifts if R is Cohen–Macaulay. In this paper we study the related problem to show that the total Betti-numbers of R are also bounded above by a function of the shifts in the minimal graded free resolution of R as well as bounded below by another function of the shifts if R is Cohen–Macaulay. We also discuss the cases when these bounds are sharp.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K equipped with the standard grading by setting $\deg(x_i) = 1$. We consider a standard graded K -algebra $R = S/I$ where $I \subset S$ is a graded ideal and the minimal graded free resolution of R :

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-j)^{\beta_{p,j}^S(R)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}^S(R)} \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0$$

where $\beta_{i,j}^S(R) = \dim_K \operatorname{Tor}_i^S(R, K)_j$ are the graded Betti numbers and $p = \operatorname{proj dim}(R)$ is the projective dimension of R . Let $\beta_i^S(R) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_{i,j}^S(R)$ be the i -th total Betti number of R . Recall that R has a *pure resolution* if the resolution has the following shape:

$$0 \rightarrow S(-d_p)^{\beta_p^S(R)} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow S(-d_1)^{\beta_1^S(R)} \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0$$

for some numbers $d_1, \dots, d_p$. Let $e(R)$ denote the multiplicity of R . If R is Cohen–Macaulay with a pure resolution, then Herzog and Kühn [12], and Huneke and Miller [16] observed that the following formulas hold:

$$e(R) = \frac{1}{p!} \prod_{i=1}^p d_i \text{ and } \beta_i^S(R) = (-1)^{i+1} \prod_{j \neq i} \frac{d_j}{d_j - d_i} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, p.$$

Consider for $1 \leq i \leq p$ the numbers

$$M_i = \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,j}^S(R) \neq 0\} \text{ and } m_i = \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,j}^S(R) \neq 0\}.$$

Recently many people studied the Multiplicity Conjecture of Herzog, Huneke and Srinivasan. (See e.g. [2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26].) This conjecture states in its original form that if $R = S/I$ is Cohen–Macaulay, then

$$\frac{1}{p!} \prod_{i=1}^p m_i \leq e(R) \leq \frac{1}{p!} \prod_{i=1}^p M_i.$$

For the lower bound the assumption that R is Cohen–Macaulay is essential. There exists a conjectured upper bound in the non Cohen–Macaulay case by replacing the number p by the codimension of R . Migliore, Nagel and the author [18] extended this conjecture by the questions that we have equality below or above if and only if R has a pure resolution. See also [2, 15] for related results. A natural question is whether under the Cohen–Macaulay assumption the i -th total Betti number $\beta_i^S(R)$ can also be bounded by using the shifts in the minimal graded free resolution of R . A natural guess for bounds is

$$(1) \quad \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i} \leq \beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$. We show that these bounds hold if R is a complete intersection and if I is componentwise linear. Moreover, in these cases we have equality above or below for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution. In general these bounds are not valid. Indeed, we give a counterexample in 3.1. For Cohen–Macaulay algebras with *strictly quasi-pure resolutions*, i.e. $m_i > M_{i-1}$ for all i , we show the bounds

$$(2) \quad \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i} \leq \beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{m_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{m_j - M_i}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Again we have equality below or above for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution. Observe that

$$\prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i} \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i},$$

because $M_i - m_j \geq m_i - m_j > 0$ for $1 \leq j < i$ and $M_j - m_i \geq m_j - m_i > 0$ for $i < j \leq p$ respectively. Thus the weaker lower bounds in (2) hold also for all cases where the lower bounds in (1) is valid. But the numbers $\prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{m_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{m_j - M_i}$ may be negative and thus are not candidates for an upper bound in general. Note that the Cohen–Macaulay assumption for the lower bound (2) is essential. We construct a non Cohen–Macaulay ideal as a counterexample in 5.2. We have that

$$\prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i} \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$$

because in the Cohen–Macaulay case we have $M_i - M_j \geq i - j$ for $1 \leq j < i$ and $M_j - M_i \geq j - i$ for $i < j \leq p$ respectively. Hence one might still ask if the upper bound

$$(3) \quad \beta_i^S(R) \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$$

is valid for $i = 1, \dots, p$. We guess that we have equality in (3) for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution. In addition to the cases mentioned above we show that the lower bounds in (2) and the upper bounds in (3) hold if S/I is Cohen–Macaulay of codimension 2 and Gorenstein of codimension 3 by using recent result of Boij and Söderberg [2]. We discuss also possible upper bounds for non Cohen–Macaulay algebras in this paper.

It remains the question if these (or similar) bounds hold for other interesting classes of ideals, or even are valid in general. We are grateful to Prof. J. Herzog for inspiring discussions on the subject of this paper.

2. COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS

One of the first examples of Cohen–Macaulay algebras are complete intersection. For this we consider a complete intersection $R = S/I$ where $I = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$ is a graded ideal generated by a regular sequence $f_1, \dots, f_p$. Let $\deg(f_i) = d_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Without loss of generality we assume that $d_1 \geq \dots \geq d_p$. The Koszul complex gives rise to a minimal graded free resolution of R and thus we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(R) &= \binom{p}{i}, \\ M_i &= d_1 + \dots + d_i, \\ m_i &= d_p + \dots + d_{p-i+1}\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, p$. Note that R has a pure resolution if and only if $d_1 = \dots = d_p$. The ideal I has a linear resolution if and only if $d_1 = \dots = d_p = 1$. Using these facts we prove:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $R = S/I$ be a complete intersection as described above. Then:*

(i) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i} \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j.$$

The first upper bound is reached for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution. Every upper bound is reached for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution.

(ii) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i} \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.$$

Every lower bound is reached for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution.

Proof. (i): To prove the upper bound we compute for $p \geq j > i$ that

$$\frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i} = \frac{d_1 + \dots + d_j}{d_{i+1} + \dots + d_j} = \frac{d_1 + \dots + d_i}{d_{i+1} + \dots + d_j} + 1 \geq \frac{i \cdot d_i}{(j-i) \cdot d_{i+1}} + 1 \geq \frac{i}{j-i} + 1 = \frac{j}{j-i}$$

and for $1 \leq j < i$ that

$$\frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} = \frac{d_1 + \dots + d_j}{d_{j+1} + \dots + d_i} \geq \frac{j \cdot d_j}{(i-j) \cdot d_{j+1}} \geq \frac{j}{(i-j)}.$$

Observe that we have equality for all integers i, j if and only if $d_1 = \dots = d_p$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_i^S(R) &= \binom{p}{i} \\
&= \frac{i-1}{1} \cdot \frac{i-2}{2} \cdots \frac{1}{i-1} \cdot \frac{p}{p-i} \cdot \frac{p-1}{p-1-i} \cdots \frac{i+1}{1} \\
&\leq \frac{M_{i-1}}{M_i - M_{i-1}} \cdot \frac{M_{i-2}}{M_i - M_{i-2}} \cdots \frac{M_1}{M_i - M_1} \cdot \frac{M_p}{M_p - M_i} \cdot \frac{M_{p-1}}{M_{p-1} - M_i} \cdots \frac{M_{i+1}}{M_{i+1} - M_i} \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality was observed in Section 1. Moreover, we have that $\beta_i^S(R) = \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ if and only if R has a pure resolution. It is also easy to see that $\beta_i^S(R) = \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ if and only if I has a linear resolution.

(ii): Similarly, it follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i} &= \frac{d_p + \dots + d_{p-j+1}}{d_{p-i} + \dots + d_{p-j+1}} = \frac{d_p + \dots + d_{p-i+1}}{d_{p-i} + \dots + d_{p-j+1}} + 1 \\
&\leq \frac{i \cdot d_{p-i+1}}{(j-i) \cdot d_{p-i}} + 1 \leq \frac{i}{(j-i)} + 1 = \frac{j}{(j-i)}
\end{aligned}$$

for $p \geq j > i$ and

$$\frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} = \frac{d_p + \dots + d_{p-j+1}}{d_{p-j} + \dots + d_{p-i+1}} \leq \frac{j \cdot d_{p-j+1}}{(i-j) \cdot d_{p-j}} \leq \frac{j}{(i-j)}$$

for $1 \leq j < i$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_i^S(R) &= \binom{p}{i} \\
&\geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i} \\
&\geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality was observed in Section 1. Again we have equations everywhere for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ if and only if R has a pure resolution.

This concludes the proof. $\square$

Remark 2.2. Instead of this direct approach one can use also recent work of Boij and Söderberg [2]. See Section 4 for details where we obtain beside other things again the lower bounds in (2) and the upper bounds in (3) using the results of [2].

More generally than considering complete intersection one might ask if some bounds are valid for an algebra S/I and $f \in S$ is a homogenous non-zero divisor on S/I , if then the corresponding bounds hold for $S/(I, f)$. One result in this direction is the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal such that S/I is a Cohen–Macaulay ring, $p = \text{projdim}(S/I)$ and $f \in S$ homogenous of degree $d > 0$ such that f is a non-zero divisor on S/I . If*

$$\beta_i^S(S/I) \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i} M_j$$

for $1 \leq i \leq p$, then we have for $1 \leq i \leq p+1$ that

$$\beta_i^S(S/(I, f)) \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p+1-i)!} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p+1, j \neq i} M_j(S/(I, f)).$$

Moreover, the inequality is an equality for all i if and only if $d = 1$ and I as well as (I, f) have an 1-linear resolution.

Proof. It is easy to see that if $F_\bullet$ is the minimal graded free resolution of S/I , then $G_\bullet$ with $G_i = F_i \oplus F_{i-1}(-d)$ and induced maps is the minimal graded free resolution of $S/(I, f)$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i^S(S/(I, f)) &= \beta_i^S(S/I) + \beta_{i-1}^S(S/I), \\ \text{projdim}(S/(I, f)) &= p+1, \\ M_{p+1}(S/(I, f)) &= M_p + d, \\ M_i(S/(I, f)) &= \max\{M_i, M_{i-1} + d\} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq p. \end{aligned}$$

We will use several times the facts that we always have $M_i \geq i$ and $M_j \geq M_i + (j-i)$ for $j > i$ since S/I is Cohen–Macaulay. For $i = 1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1^S(S/(I, f)) &= \beta_1^S(S/I) + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq p} M_j + 1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(p-1)!} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq p} M_j + \frac{1}{p!} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq p} M_j \\ &= \frac{p+1}{p!} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq p} M_j \\ &\leq \frac{M_{p+1}(S/(I, f))}{(p+1-1)!} \prod_{2 \leq j \leq p} M_j(S/(I, f)). \end{aligned}$$

For $1 < i \leq p+1$ we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
& (i-1)! \cdot (p+1-i)! \cdot \beta_i^S(S/(I, f)) \\
&= (i-1)! \cdot (p+1-i)! \cdot (\beta_i^S(S/I) + \beta_{i-1}^S(S/I)) \\
&\leq ((p+1-i) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i} M_j) + ((i-1) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i-1} M_j) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j \cdot (M_{i-1} \cdot (p-i+1) + (i-1) \cdot M_i) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j \cdot (M_{i-1} \cdot (p-i) + M_{i-1} + (i-1) \cdot M_i) \\
&\leq \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j(S/(I, f)) \cdot (M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) \cdot (p-i) + M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) + (i-1) \cdot M_i) \\
&\leq \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j(S/(I, f)) \\
&\quad \cdot (M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) \cdot (p-i) + M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) + M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) \cdot M_i) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j(S/(I, f)) \cdot ((M_i + (p-i)) \cdot M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) + M_{i-1}(S/(I, f))) \\
&\leq \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j(S/(I, f)) \cdot (M_{p+1} \cdot M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) + d \cdot M_{i-1}(S/(I, f))) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p, j \neq i, i-1} M_j(S/(I, f)) \cdot M_{p+1}(S/(I, f)) \cdot M_{i-1}(S/(I, f)) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j \leq p+1, j \neq i} M_j(S/(I, f)).
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing by $(i-1)! \cdot (p+1-i)!$ we get the desired bound. It is easy to see that the inequality is an equality for all i if and only if $d = 1$ and I as well as (I, f) have an 1-linear resolution. $\square$

3. IDEALS WITH STRICTLY QUASI-PURE RESOLUTIONS

Motivated by the results of Section 2 one could hope that the bounds in (1) are always valid. This is not the case as the following example shows.

Example 3.1. We consider the following situation. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_6]$ be a polynomial ring in 6 variables and consider the graded ideal $I = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_2x_4 - x_5x_6, x_3x_4)$. Using for example CoCoA [4] one checks that S/I is Cohen–Macaulay of dimension 3 and it has the minimal graded free resolution:

$$0 \rightarrow S^2(-5) \rightarrow S^2(-3) \oplus S^3(-4) \rightarrow S^4(-2) \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0$$

which is not pure. We have

$$M_1 = m_1 = 2, M_2 = 4, m_2 = 3, M_3 = m_3 = 5.$$

But

$$\frac{M_2}{M_2 - M_1} \cdot \frac{M_3}{M_3 - M_1} = \frac{4}{2} \cdot \frac{5}{3} = \frac{20}{6} < 4 = \beta_1^S(R)$$

and hence the upper bound of (1) is not valid. Moreover,

$$\frac{m_2}{m_2 - m_1} \cdot \frac{m_3}{m_3 - m_1} = \frac{3}{1} \cdot \frac{5}{3} = 5 > 4 = \beta_1^S(R).$$

Hence also the lower bound of (1) is false in general. But the resolution is strictly quasi-pure since $m_i > M_{i-1}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Note that the bounds in (2) hold. Indeed, e.g. for $\beta_1^S(R)$ we have

$$\frac{M_2}{m_2 - M_1} \cdot \frac{M_3}{m_3 - M_1} = \frac{4}{1} \cdot \frac{5}{3} = \frac{20}{3} > 4 = \beta_1^S(R)$$

and

$$\frac{m_2}{M_2 - m_1} \cdot \frac{m_3}{M_3 - m_1} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{5}{3} = \frac{15}{6} < 4 = \beta_1^S(R).$$

We recall the following well-known result which is due to Peskine and Szpiro [23].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal such that $R = S/I$ is Cohen–Macaulay and $p = \text{proj dim}(R)$. Then:*

- (i) $\sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^i \sum_j \beta_{ij}^S(R) = \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^i \beta_i^S(R) = -1.$
- (ii) $\sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^i \sum_j j^k \cdot \beta_{ij}^S(R) = 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq p-1.$

Proof. We have $\sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^i \sum_j \beta_{ij}^S(R) = \sum_{i=1}^p (-1)^i \beta_i^S(R) = -\beta_0^S(R) = -1.$ For a proof of the other equalities see also e.g. [13, Lemma 1.1]. $\square$

We see that the graded Betti numbers satisfy a certain system of equalities. Note that if R has a pure resolution, then using this system, Cramer’s rule and the Vandermonde determinant it is not difficult to prove the formulas of the multiplicity and the total Betti-numbers in [12] and [16]. Recall from [13] that R has a *quasi-pure resolution* if $m_i \geq M_{i-1}$ for all i . Unfortunately, we can not prove in general the bounds in (2) for the total Betti-numbers in this case. We say that R has a *strictly quasi-pure resolution* if $m_i > M_{i-1}$ for all i . In this case we show that the bounds in (2) are valid. The idea of the proof is similar to the one of [13, Theorem 1.2].

Theorem 3.3. *Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal such that $R = S/I$ is Cohen–Macaulay and has a strictly quasi-pure resolution and $p = \text{proj dim}(R)$. Then*

- (i) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{m_i - M_j} \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{m_j - M_i} \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j.$$

The first upper bound is reached for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution. Every upper bound is reached for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution.

- (ii) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.$$

Every lower bound is reached for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution.

Proof. We consider the $(p \times p)$ -square matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_j \beta_{1j}^S(R) & \sum_j \beta_{2j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j \beta_{pj}^S(R) \\ \sum_j j \cdot \beta_{1j}^S(R) & \sum_j j \cdot \beta_{2j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j \cdot \beta_{pj}^S(R) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_j j^{p-1} \cdot \beta_{1j}^S(R) & \sum_j j^{p-1} \cdot \beta_{2j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j^{p-1} \cdot \beta_{pj}^S(R) \end{pmatrix}.$$

We compute the determinant of A as

$$\det(A) = \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_p} V(j_1, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p} \beta_{lj_l}^S(R)$$

with the Vandermonde determinants

$$V(j_1, \dots, j_p) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ j_1 & j_2 & \cdots & j_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ j_1^{p-1} & j_2^{p-1} & \cdots & j_p^{p-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since R has a strictly quasi-pure resolution we have that $j_i > j_k$ for all integers i, k such that $i > k$, $\beta_{ij_i}^S(R) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{kj_k}^S(R) \neq 0$. Thus all the involved Vandermonde determinants are always positive.

We may compute $\det(A)$ also in a different way. Fix $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. By replacing the i -th column of A by the alternating sum of all columns of A , we obtain a matrix A' such that $\det(A) = \det(A')$. It follows from Lemma 3.2, that the i -th column of A' is the transpose of the vector $((-1)^{i+1}, 0, \dots, 0)$. Hence by expanding the determinant of A' with respect to the i -th column, we get

$$\det(A) = \det(A') = \det(B),$$

where B is the $(p-1 \times p-1)$ -matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sum_j j \beta_{1j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j \beta_{i-1j}^S(R) & \sum_j j \beta_{i+1j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j \beta_{pj}^S(R) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_j j^{p-1} \beta_{1j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j^{p-1} \beta_{i-1j}^S(R) & \sum_j j^{p-1} \beta_{i+1j}^S(R) & \cdots & \sum_j j^{p-1} \beta_{pj}^S(R) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \det(A) &= \det(B) \\ &= \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_{i-1}} \sum_{j_{i+1}} \cdots \sum_{j_p} U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} j_l \cdot \beta_{lj_l}^S(R) \end{aligned}$$

with the corresponding Vandermonde determinants

$$\begin{aligned} &U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \\ &= \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ j_1 & \cdots & j_{i-1} & j_{i+1} & \cdots & j_p \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ j_1^{p-2} & \cdots & j_{i-1}^{p-2} & j_{i+1}^{p-2} & \cdots & j_p^{p-2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$V(j_1, \dots, j_p) = \prod_{i < l \leq p} (j_l - j_i) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (j_i - j_l) \cdot U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p).$$

All in all we obtain from the discussion so far that

$$(4) \quad \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_p} \prod_{i < l \leq p} (j_l - j_i) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (j_i - j_l) \cdot U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p} \beta_{l_{j_l}}^S(R) \\ = \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_{i-1}} \sum_{j_{i+1}} \cdots \sum_{j_p} U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} j_l \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} \beta_{l_{j_l}}^S(R).$$

It follows from the fact that R has a strict quasi-pure resolution that for all integers l

$$(5) \quad \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (m_i - M_l) \prod_{i < l \leq p} (m_l - M_i) \\ \leq \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (j_i - j_l) \prod_{i < l \leq p} (j_l - j_i) \leq \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (M_i - m_l) \prod_{i < l \leq p} (M_l - m_i).$$

We always have for those j_l with $\beta_{l_{j_l}}^S(R) \neq 0$ that

$$(6) \quad \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} m_l \leq \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} j_l \leq \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} M_l.$$

Using (4), the lower bound of (5) and the upper bound of (6) we obtain

$$\beta_i^S(R) \cdot \prod_{i < l \leq p} (m_l - M_i) \prod_{1 \leq l < i} (m_i - M_l) \\ \cdot \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_{i-1}} \sum_{j_{i+1}} \cdots \sum_{j_p} U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} \beta_{l_{j_l}}^S(R) \\ \leq \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} M_l \sum_{j_1} \cdots \sum_{j_{i-1}} \sum_{j_{i+1}} \cdots \sum_{j_p} U(j_1, \dots, j_{i-1}, j_{i+1}, \dots, j_p) \cdot \prod_{1 \leq l \leq p, l \neq i} \beta_{l_{j_l}}^S(R)$$

and thus

$$\beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{m_i - M_j} \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{m_j - M_i}.$$

Analogously using (4), the upper bound of (5) and the lower bound of (6) we get

$$\beta_i^S(R) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.$$

Checking the inequalities we see that we have equality above or below for all $1 \leq i \leq p$ if and only if R has a pure resolution. We already observed that we have the inequalities $\prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{m_i - M_j} \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{m_j - M_i} \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)!(p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$. A straight forward discussion shows that $\beta_i^S(R) = \frac{1}{(i-1)!(p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j$ for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution. This concludes the proof. $\square$

4. LOW CODIMENSIONS

The next interesting cases where we can verify bounds are those in low codimensions. In fact we recall at first a version of a conjecture of Boij and Söderberg [2] which implies the desired bounds. Then we observe that this conjecture is true in low codimensions.

Fix a positive integer p . For any strictly increasing sequence of positive integers $d = (d_1, \dots, d_p)$ we define a diagram $\pi(d)$ by

$$\pi(d)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \prod_{1 \leq k < i} \frac{d_k}{d_i - d_k} \prod_{i < k \leq p} \frac{d_k}{d_k - d_i} & \text{if } j = d_i, \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

and call $\pi(d)$ a *pure diagram*. A pure diagram is called *linear* if $d_k = d_1 + (k-1)$ for $1 \leq k \leq p$. There exists a partial order on pure diagrams by defining $\pi(d) \leq \pi(d')$ for two increasing sequences of positive integers $d = (d_1, \dots, d_p)$ and $d' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_p)$ if and only if $d \leq d'$ coefficientwise. For two fixed increasing sequences of positive integers $\underline{d}$ and $\bar{d}$ denote by $\Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}$ the set of pure diagrams $\pi(d)$ such that $\pi(\underline{d}) \leq \pi(d) \leq \pi(\bar{d})$. Since $\pi(d)_{i,j} \neq 0$ only for finitely many i, j we can consider the convex hull of $\Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}$, that is the set of convex combinations $D = \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \pi(d)$ with real non-negative coefficients λ_d and $\sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d = 1$. Part of the conjecture of Boij and Söderberg [2, Conjecture 2.4] is that for a Cohen–Macaulay algebra R of projective dimension p the Betti-diagram $\beta^S(R) = (\beta_{i,j}^S(R))$ is a convex combination of the convex hull of $\Pi_{m,M}$ where $m = (m_1, \dots, m_p)$ and $M = (M_1, \dots, M_p)$ and the m_i, M_i are the usual maximal and minimal shifts in the minimal graded free resolution of R .

Now consider again the general convex hull of $\Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}$, and a convex combination D as described above. We define formally for $1 \leq i \leq p$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ the numbers

$$\beta_{i,j}(D) = \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \pi(d)_{i,j}, \quad \beta_i(D) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \beta_{i,j}(D)$$

and

$$M_i(D) = \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,j}(D) \neq 0\} \text{ and } m_i(D) = \min\{j \in \mathbb{Z} : \beta_{i,j}(D) \neq 0\}.$$

Observe that

$$M_i(D) = \max\{d_i : \lambda_d \neq 0\} \text{ and } m_i(D) = \min\{d_i : \lambda_d \neq 0\}.$$

Note also that it follows from the definition of the diagrams $\pi(d)$ that $M_i(D) < M_{i+1}(D)$ and $m_i(D) < m_{i+1}(D)$ hold for $1 \leq i < p$. Now we can prove the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\underline{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_p)$ and $\bar{d} = (\bar{d}_1, \dots, \bar{d}_p)$ be two strictly increasing sequences of positive integers such that $\underline{d} \leq \bar{d}$. Assume that $D = \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \pi(d)$ is a convex combination of elements of $\Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}$. Then:*

(i) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i(D) \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j(D).$$

The upper bound is reached for all i if and only if D is a linear diagram.

(ii) We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that

$$\beta_i(D) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_i(D) - m_j(D)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_j(D) - m_i(D)}.$$

Every lower bound is reached for all i if and only if D is a pure diagram.

Proof. (i): We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(D) &= \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \pi(d)_i \\ &= \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{d_j}{d_i - d_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{d_j}{d_j - d_i} \\ &\leq \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}, \lambda_d \neq 0} \lambda_d \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j(D)}{i - j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j(D)}{j - i} \\ &= \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j(D). \end{aligned}$$

Note that if D is not a pure diagram, then the inequality is strict. But even for a pure diagram which is not linear the inequality is strict. Hence we have equality if and only if D is a linear diagram.

(ii): Observe that $M_i(D) - m_j(D) \geq m_i(D) - m_j(D) > 0$ for $j < i$ and similar $M_j(D) - m_i(D) > 0$ for $i < j$. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(D) &= \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \pi(d)_i \\ &= \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}} \lambda_d \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{d_j}{d_i - d_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{d_j}{d_j - d_i} \\ &\geq \sum_{\pi(d) \in \Pi_{\underline{d}, \bar{d}}, \lambda_d \neq 0} \lambda_d \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_i(D) - m_j(D)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_j(D) - m_i(D)} \\ &= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_i(D) - m_j(D)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j(D)}{M_j(D) - m_i(D)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that if D is not a pure diagram, then the inequalities are strict in general. Hence we have equalities for all i if and only if D is a pure diagram. $\square$

Thus we obtain that the lower bounds in (2) and the upper bounds in (3) hold once one can prove [2, Conjecture 2.4]. This conjecture is open in general, but for a number of interesting cases Boij and Söderberg could prove it in [2]. In particular, they showed it for codimension 2 Cohen–Macaulay algebras, codimension 3 Gorenstein algebras and complete intersections. For the latter case we proved in Section 2 better bounds and we do not include this class of rings in the next corollary. As always K is a field and $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ a standard graded polynomial ring.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal such that $R = S/I$ is either Cohen–Macaulay of codimension 2 or Gorenstein of codimension 3 and $p = \text{proj dim}(R)$. Then:*

(i) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j.$$

The upper bound is reached for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution.

(ii) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.$$

Every lower bound is reached for all i if and only if R has a pure resolution.

5. COMPONENTWISE LINEAR IDEALS

Let $I \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a graded ideal. Recall that I has a k -linear resolution if $\beta_{i,i+j}^S(I) = 0$ for $j \neq k$. For a non-negative integer k we denote by $I_{\langle k \rangle} \subset S$ the ideal which is generated by all elements in I_k . Herzog and Hibi [11] called I *componentwise linear* if $I_{\langle k \rangle}$ has a k -linear resolution for all $k \geq 0$.

It is well-known that a lot of important classes of ideals in combinatorial commutative algebra are componentwise linear. Recall that an ideal $I \subset S$ is called a *monomial ideal* if it is generated by monomials of S . Then we denote by $G(I)$ the unique minimal system of generators of I . A monomial ideal $I \subset S$ is called *strongly stable*, if for all monomials $x^u = \prod_{k=1}^n x_k^{u_k} \in G(I)$ and i with $x_i | x^u$ we have for all $1 \leq j \leq i$ that $(x^u/x_i)x_j \in I$. It is well-known that strongly stable ideals are componentwise linear. But also stable ideals, squarefree (strongly) stable ideals and more generally $\mathbf{a}$ -stable ideal are componentwise linear. (See [24, Theorem 3.11] for definitions and a proof.) In particular, this implies that all generic initial ideals are componentwise linear. (E.g. see [1] or [15, Lemma 3.3].)

In the proof of the next theorem we will need the Eliahou–Kervaire formula [6] for the graded Betti-numbers of a strongly stable ideal I : we have for all $i \geq 1$ and $j \geq 0$ that $\beta_{i,i+j}^S(S/I) = \sum_{x^u \in G(I), \deg x^u = j+1} \binom{m(u)-1}{i-1}$ where we set $m(u) = \max\{i : 1 \leq i \leq n, u_i > 0\}$ for a monomial x^u with $u \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Here we make the convention that $\binom{a}{b} = 0$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ unless $0 \leq b \leq a$. (Note that these formulas above are already true for stable ideals.) Observe the following facts. If $\beta_{i,i+j}^S(S/I) \neq 0$ for some i , then $\beta_{k,k+j}^S(S/I) \neq 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq i$. Moreover, only those $x^u \in G(I)$ with $m(u) \geq i$ are relevant for the total i -th Betti number $\beta_i^S(S/I) \neq 0$ and then $\deg x^u \geq m_i - i + 1$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $I \subset S$ be a componentwise linear ideal such that $R = S/I$ is Cohen–Macaulay and $p = \text{proj dim}(R)$. Then:*

(i) *We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(R) \leq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i} \leq \frac{1}{(i-1)! \cdot (p-i)!} \prod_{j \neq i} M_j.$$

Every upper bound is reached for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution.

(ii) We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that

$$\beta_i^S(R) \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{m_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{m_j - m_i} \geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j}{M_i - m_j} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq p} \frac{m_j}{M_j - m_i}.$$

Every lower bound is reached for all i if and only if I has a linear resolution.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume that the field K is infinite. We denote by $\text{gin}(I)$ the generic initial ideal of I with respect to the reverse lexicographical order. The proof of the main result in [1] and [15, Lemma 3.3] shows that $\text{gin}(I)$ has the same graded Betti numbers as I and is a stable ideal in all characteristics. If we replace I by $\text{gin}(I)$, then the Betti numbers of I do not depend on the characteristic of K and we may assume that $\text{char}(K) = 0$. Replacing another time I by $\text{gin}(I)$ does not change the Betti numbers and thus we may now assume that I is a strongly stable ideal.

Since R is Cohen–Macaulay and it is known that $x_n, \dots, x_{n-\text{depth}(R)+1}$ is a regular sequence for R , we may assume that $\dim(R) = 0$ and thus a pure power of each variable belongs to I . Let $a > 0$ be the smallest natural number such that $x_n^a \in I$. Then $\deg(x^u) \leq a$ for all $x^u \in G(I)$ and $x_n^a \in G(I)$, because I is strongly stable. Note that for (i) and (ii) we have to show only the corresponding first inequalities, since the other are trivially true as noted in the other sections of this paper.

(i): It follows from the Eliahou–Kervaire formula for the graded Betti numbers of R that

$$M_i = a + i - 1 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

We have that $(x_1, \dots, x_n)^a \subseteq I$ and thus it follows from [5, Theorem 3.2] that

$$\beta_i^S(S/I) \leq \beta_i^S(S/(x_1, \dots, x_n)^a) = \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{M_j}{M_i - M_j} \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{M_j}{M_j - M_i}$$

where the last equation follows from the fact that $(x_1, \dots, x_n)^a$ has an a -linear resolution, the maximal shifts coincide with the ones of I and that in this case the equation follows from [12, Theorem 1]).

If I has a linear resolution, then $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^a$ and the upper bounds for $\beta_i^S(S/I)$ are reached. Assume that we have equations everywhere. Then it follows that $\beta_i^S(S/I) = \beta_i^S(S/(x_1, \dots, x_n)^a)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. In the proof of [5, Theorem 3.2] it is shown, that this implies

$$|x^u \in G(I_{\langle j \rangle}) : m(u) = k| = |x^u \in G((x_1, \dots, x_n)_{\langle j \rangle}^a) : m(u) = k| \text{ for } j \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq k \leq n - 1.$$

This implies that $I_{\langle j \rangle} = 0$ for $j < a$ and thus $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^a$. Hence I has an a -linear resolution.

(ii): Fix $1 \leq i \leq n$ and write $m_i = i + b - 1$ for some natural number b . Let $J = I_{\geq b}$ be the ideal which is generated by all elements of I of degree greater or equal to b . It follows from the Eliahou–Kervaire formula and the observations given above that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j^S(S/J) &= \beta_j^S(S/I) \text{ for } j \geq i, \\ m_j(S/J) &= m_j(S/I) \text{ for } j \geq i, \\ m_j(S/J) &\geq m_j(S/I) \text{ for } 1 \leq j < i, \\ m_j(S/J) &= m_i(S/J) - (i - j) \text{ for } 1 \leq j < i. \end{aligned}$$

Note that S/J is still zero dimensional. Assume that we could prove the lower bound for S/J , then it would follow that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_i^S(S/I) &= \beta_i^S(S/J) \\
&\geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_i(S/J) - m_j(S/J)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_j(S/J) - m_i(S/J)} \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/J)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/I)}{m_j(S/I) - m_i(S/I)} \\
&\geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/I)}{m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/I)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/I)}{m_j(S/I) - m_i(S/I)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because for $1 \leq j < i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/J)} \geq \frac{m_j(S/I)}{m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/I)} \\
\Leftrightarrow &m_j(S/J)m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/J)m_j(S/I) \geq m_j(S/I)m_i(S/I) - m_j(S/I)m_j(S/J) \\
\Leftrightarrow &m_j(S/J)m_i(S/I) \geq m_j(S/I)m_i(S/I) \\
\Leftrightarrow &m_j(S/J) \geq m_j(S/I).
\end{aligned}$$

Here the last inequality follows from the definition of J as noted above. It remains to show the lower bound for $\beta_i^S(S/J)$. Let $L = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^b$. We observe that $J \subseteq L$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
m_j(S/L) &= m_i(S/L) - (i - j) \text{ for } 1 \leq j < i, \\
m_j(S/L) &= m_i(S/L) + (j - i) \text{ for } i < j \leq n, \\
m_j(S/J) &= m_j(S/L) \text{ for } j \leq i, \\
m_j(S/J) &\geq m_j(S/L) \text{ for } i < j \leq n.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it follows from [5, Theorem 3.2] that $\beta_i^S(S/J) \geq \beta_i^S(S/L)$. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_i^S(S/J) &\geq \beta_i^S(S/(x_1, \dots, x_n)^b) \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/L)}{m_i(S/L) - m_j(S/L)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/L)}{m_j(S/L) - m_i(S/L)} \\
&= \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_i(S/J) - m_j(S/J)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/L)}{m_j(S/L) - m_i(S/J)} \\
&\geq \prod_{1 \leq j < i} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_i(S/J) - m_j(S/J)} \cdot \prod_{i < j \leq n} \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_j(S/J) - m_i(S/J)}
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows because for $i < j \leq n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{m_j(S/L)}{m_j(S/L) - m_i(S/J)} &\geq \frac{m_j(S/J)}{m_j(S/J) - m_i(S/J)} \\ \Leftrightarrow m_j(S/L)m_j(S/J) - m_j(S/L)m_i(S/J) &\geq m_j(S/J)m_j(S/L) - m_j(S/J)m_i(S/J) \\ \Leftrightarrow -m_j(S/L)m_i(S/J) &\geq -m_j(S/J)m_i(S/J) \\ \Leftrightarrow m_j(S/J) &\geq m_j(S/L). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality is valid as noted above. Thus we get the desired lower bound for J and hence also for I .

Assume that for all i the lower bound for $\beta_i^S(S/I)$ is reached. For $i = 1$ the corresponding constructed J is just I . It follows then also that $\beta_1^S(S/I) = \beta_1^S(S/L)$ and applying again [5, Theorem 3.2] we see that $\beta_i^S(S/I) = \beta_i^S(S/L)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Now we deduce as in the proof of (i) that indeed I has a linear resolution. This concludes the proof. $\square$

The Cohen–Macaulay assumption is essential for the lower bound (2). In fact, we can construct a strongly stable ideal as a counterexample. The ideal is taken from [13].

Example 5.2. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_4]$ be a polynomial ring in 4 variables and we consider the strongly stable ideal $I = (x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_2^3, x_2^2x_3, x_2^2x_4)$. Then S/I is not Cohen–Macaulay because $\dim(S/I) = 2$ and $\text{depth}(S/I) = 0$. It follows from the Eliahou–Kervaire formula that

$$\beta_1^S(S/I) = 5, \beta_2^S(S/I) = 7, \beta_3^S(S/I) = 4, \beta_4^S(S/I) = 1$$

and

$$m_1 = 2, m_2 = 3, m_3 = 5, M_4 = m_4 = 6.$$

But now

$$\beta_4^S(S/I) = 1 < \frac{m_3}{M_4 - m_3} \cdot \frac{m_2}{M_4 - m_2} \cdot \frac{m_1}{M_4 - m_1} = \frac{5 \cdot 3 \cdot 2}{1 \cdot 3 \cdot 4} = \frac{30}{12}.$$

On the other hand for strongly stable ideals we still can give an upper bound for the i -th total Betti number without the Cohen–Macaulay assumption.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $I \subset S$ be a componentwise linear ideal and $p = \text{codim}(S/I)$. We have for $i = 1, \dots, p$ that*

$$\beta_i^S(S/I) \leq \binom{i + M_1 - 2}{i - 1} \cdot \binom{p + M_1 - 1}{p - i}.$$

The upper bound is reached for all i if and only if S/I is Cohen–Macaulay and I has a linear resolution.

Proof. As shown in the proof of 5.3 we may assume that $\text{char}(K) = 0$ and that I is a strongly stable ideal. It is known that $x_n, \dots, x_{n - \text{depth}(S/I) + 1}$ is a regular sequence for S/I and thus we may assume that $\text{depth}(S/I) = 0$, i.e. $\text{proj dim}(S/I) = n$.

Let $J = I_{\geq M_1(S/I)}$ be the ideal which is generated by all elements of I of degree greater or equal to $M_1(S/I)$. It follows from [5, Theorem 3.2] that $\beta_i^S(S/I) \leq \beta_i^S(S/J)$. Note that $M_i \leq M_1 + i - 1$ as one deduces from the Eliahou–Kervaire formula. By construction of

J we have $M_1(S/J) = M_1$ and J has an M_1 -linear resolution. Assuming that we can show the upper bound for S/J , we get for $1 \leq i \leq n$ that

$$\beta_i^S(S/I) \leq \beta_i^S(S/J) \leq \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{n+M_1-1}{n-i}.$$

It remains to show the upper bound for S/J . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i^S(S/J) &= \sum_{x^u \in G(J)} \binom{m(u)-1}{i-1} \\ &= \sum_{j=i}^n \binom{j-1}{i-1} |\{x^u \in G(J) : m(u) = j\}| \\ &\leq \sum_{j=i}^n \binom{j-1}{i-1} \binom{j+M_1-1-1}{M_1-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We prove by induction on $n-i$ that

$$\sum_{j=i}^n \binom{j-1}{i-1} \binom{j+M_1-2}{M_1-1} = \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{n+M_1-1}{n-i}.$$

The assertion is trivial for $i = n$. Let $i < n$. Using the induction hypothesis we compute

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=i}^n \binom{j-1}{i-1} \binom{j+M_1-2}{j-1} \\ &= \sum_{j=i}^{n-1} \binom{j-1}{i-1} \binom{j+M_1-2}{j-1} + \binom{n-1}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-1} \\ &= \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{n-1+M_1-1}{n-1-i} + \binom{n-1}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-1} \\ &= \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{n+M_1-1}{n-i} \\ &\quad - \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-i} + \binom{n-1}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-1} \\ &= \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{n+M_1-1}{n-i} \end{aligned}$$

because $\binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-i} = \binom{n-1}{i-1} \binom{n+M_1-2}{n-1}$ as one verifies by a direct computation. If S/I is Cohen–Macaulay and I has a (M_1) -linear resolution, then we know by [12] that $\beta_i^S(S/I)$ reaches the upper bound for all i . Assume now that $\beta_i^S(S/I) = \binom{i+M_1-2}{i-1} \cdot \binom{p+M_1-1}{p-i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$. As seen above we may assume that $p = n$. Then the corresponding bounds for S/J are also achieved. It follows from the inequalities above that every monomial of degree M_1 is a minimal generator of J . This means that $J = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^{M_1}$. Thus S/J is zero dimensional and hence Cohen–Macaulay. But since $J = I_{\geq M_1}$ then also S/I is zero dimensional and therefore Cohen–Macaulay. Now we can apply Theorem 5.1 (i) to conclude that I has a linear resolution. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aramova, J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Ideals with stable Betti numbers*. Adv. Math. **152**, No.1, 72–77 (2000).
- [2] M. Boij and J. Söderberg, *Graded Betti numbers of Cohen-Macaulay modules and the Multiplicity conjecture*. Preprint 2006.
- [3] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen–Macaulay rings*. Rev. ed. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **39**, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (1998).
- [4] CoCoATeam, *CoCoA: a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra*, Available at <http://cocoa.dima.unige.it>.
- [5] A. Conca, J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Rigid resolutions and big Betti numbers*. Comment. Math. Helv. **79**, No.4, 826–839 (2004).
- [6] S. Eliahou and M. Kervaire, *Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals*. J. Algebra **129** (1990), 1–25.
- [7] C.A. Francisco, *New approaches to bounding the multiplicity of an ideal*. J. Algebra **299**, No. 1, 309–328 (2006).
- [8] L.H. Gold, *A degree bound for codimension two lattice ideals*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **182**, No.2–3, 201–207 (2003).
- [9] L. Gold, H. Schenck and H. Srinivasan, *Betti Numbers and Degree Bounds for Some Linked Zero-Schemes*. Preprint 2005.
- [10] E. Guardo and A. Van Tuyl, *Powers of complete intersections: Graded Betti numbers and applications*. Ill. J. Math. **49**, No. 1, 265–279 (2005).
- [11] J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Componentwise linear ideals*. Nagoya Math. J. **153**, 141–153 (1999).
- [12] J. Herzog and M. Kühl, *On the Betti numbers of finite pure and linear resolutions*. Commun. Algebra **12**, 1627–1646 (1984).
- [13] J. Herzog and H. Srinivasan, *Bounds for multiplicities*. Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **350**, No.7, 2879–2902 (1998).
- [14] J. Herzog and H. Srinivasan, *Multiplicities of monomial ideals*. J. Algebra **274**, No. 1, 230–244 (2004).
- [15] J. Herzog and X. Zheng, *Notes on the multiplicity conjecture*. Collect. Math. **57**, No. 2, 211–226 (2006).
- [16] C. Huneke and M. Miller, *A note on the multiplicity of Cohen-Macaulay algebras with pure resolutions*. Can. J. Math. **37**, 1149–1162 (1985).
- [17] M. Kubitzke and V. Welker, *The Multiplicity Conjecture for Barycentric Subdivisions*. Preprint 2006.
- [18] J. Migliore, U. Nagel and T. Römer, *The multiplicity conjecture in low codimensions*. Math. Res. Lett. **12**, No. 5–6, 731–747 (2005).
- [19] J. Migliore, U. Nagel and T. Römer, *Extensions of the multiplicity conjecture*. To appear in Trans. Am. Math. Soc.
- [20] J. Migliore, U. Nagel and F. Zanello, *An improved Multiplicity Conjecture for codimension three Gorenstein algebras*. Preprint 2006.
- [21] R.M. Miró-Roig, *A note on the multiplicity of determinantal ideals*. J. Algebra **299**, No. 2, 714–724 (2006).
- [22] I. Novik and E. Swartz, *Face ring multiplicity via CM-connectivity sequences*. Preprint 2006.
- [23] C. Peskine and L. Szpiro, *Syzygies et multiplicités*. C. R. Acad. Sci., Paris, Sér. A **278**, 1421–1424 (1974).
- [24] T. Römer, *Note on bounds for multiplicities*. J. Pure Appl. Algebra **195**, No. 1, 113–123 (2005).
- [25] H. Srinivasan, *A note on the multiplicities of Gorenstein algebras*. J. Algebra **208**, No.2, 425–443 (1998).
- [26] Fabrizio Zanello, *Improving the bounds in the Multiplicity Conjecture: the codimension 3 level case*. Preprint 2005.